

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Restriction Requirement dated December 8, 2005, the Examiner groups the claims into two groupings: Group I to Claims 2-14 and Group II to Claims 27-35. The Examiner further goes on to state that if the Applicants elect one of Group I or Group II, embodiments of Figures 10, 15, 19, 21, and 22 must be elected. Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 10 is the embodiment of each and every one of the claims in the present application. Therefore, species A is elected. Also, Applicants provisionally elect Claims 27-35 directed to Group II.

Applicants object to the Examiner's restriction requirement breaking down the claims into nearly every single claim. This is evidenced by paragraph 5 of the restriction requirement which breaks up Claims 2, 3, 4, and 5. Claims 2, 3, 4, and 5 are dependent upon Claim 9 and Claim 9 is believed to be generic. Paragraph 6 also applies to the present claims in which Claims 29, 30 and 31 have been broken into a separate classification. Claims 29, 30 and 31 depend from Claim 27. Therefore, Claim 27 is believed to be generic enough to encompass each of these claims. Likewise, paragraph 7 of the restriction requirement breaks Claims 32, 33, 34, and 35 into separate classifications. Claims 32-35 also depend from Claim 27 and, as mentioned above, Claim 27 is believed to be generic. Claims 27 and Claim 9 are very similar except one is a method and one is an apparatus. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the restriction division of generic Groups I and II. In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants elect Group I, Claims 27-35. Provisionally, Applicants also elect Claim 30 corresponding to species B2. Applicants in paragraph 7 are required to select from Claims 32, 33 or 34 on the election of 1 of the species B1-B3. Applicants hereby also elects Claim 32.

With respect to the restriction requirement as a whole, the undersigned has never seen such a convoluted restriction requirement of almost 13 years of registered practice. The breakdown into multiple sub-species by the Examiner, particularly paragraphs 6 and 7, do not appear to make logical sense. This is due to the fact that each of these claims depends from Claim 27. How could one of Claims 32-35 be selected while also picking one of Claims 29-31? Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to examine Claim 27 and each of its dependent claims since it appears to be generic. Applicants also respectfully request the Examiner to seek supervisory consultation with respect to this matter.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants submit that all objections are now overcome. Applicants respectfully submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or

comments the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney. Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin G. Mierzwa
Reg. No. 38,049
28333 Telegraph Road
Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Date: 1/6/06